

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action dated March 31, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-22 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8 and 14 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated March 31, 2008, Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and Claims 2, 4-6, and 10-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-22 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Kasraian for the courtesy of a telephone interview on June 5, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that their representative's diligence in preparing the patent application for this and related cases inured to their benefit for the purposes of swearing behind Examiner's reference. The Examiner stated that he would need to consult with another Examiner with more expertise in such affidavits prior to making a decision and requested a subsequent interview to discuss the matter further.

Furthermore, Applicants thank Examiner Kasraian for the courtesy of a second telephone interview on June 10, 2008, to further discuss the details of Applicants' proposed affidavit. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0181484 ("*Rogalski*"). Independent Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services." Amended Claim 8 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments may be found at least on page 9, line 19-28.

Consistent with exemplary embodiments, a broadband residential gateway (BRG) may communicate with a first wired data network portion. (See specification page 9, lines 19-20.) The first wired data network portion may include various functions that provide for voice and data services to a digital cordless handset. (See specification page 9, lines 20-21.) For example, the first wired data network portion may provide a home location register (HLR) that maintains information for each subscriber to the voice and data services provided to the digital cordless handset. (See specification page 9, lines 21-23.) The information may include identification information for a user which may be used to verify legitimacy of an attempt to access the voice and data services and may also store features applicable for the user identification. (See specification page 9, lines 23-26.)

In contrast, *Rogalski* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from amended Claim 1. For example, *Rogalski* merely discloses that a voice data gateway (VDG) is connected to both a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and a broadband network. (See paragraph [0023], lines 2-4.) *Rogalski*'s VDG is also connected to a wired data terminal (e.g., a personal computer), a wireless data terminal (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and a hybrid data/voice terminal (e.g., a cordless handset). (See paragraph [0023], lines 4-7.) Nowhere does *Rogalski* disclose providing subscriber-specific information to voice and data services, however. *Rogalski* merely discloses sharing access to a PSTN among multiple terminals.

*Rogalski* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Rogalski* at least do not disclose "wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 8 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 8 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 8.

Dependent Claims 3, 7, and 9 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 8, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 7, and 9.

### III. Rejection of Claims 14-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,404,764 ("*Jones*") in view of *Rogalski*. Claim 14 has been amended,

and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

In contrast, *Jones* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from amended Claim 1. For example, *Jones* merely discloses supplying customers with broadband internet access in their home or businesses via a network premises gateway. (See col. 2, lines 12-14.) A whole-home IP telephone system with Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) functionality and associated internet connectivity is embedded in *Jones's* network premises gateway. (See col. 2, lines 14-16.) Thus, in *Jones*, the network premises gateway is enabled to access a wide area network and internet. (See col. 2, lines 16-18.) Nowhere does *Jones* disclose providing subscriber-specific information to voice and data services, however. Rather, *Jones* merely discloses providing VoIP services via a network gateway.

Furthermore, as stated above, *Rogalski* does not overcome *Jones's* deficiencies. For example, *Rogalski* merely discloses that a voice data gateway (VDG) is connected to both a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and a broadband network. (See paragraph [0023], lines 2-4.) *Rogalski's* VDG is also connected to a wired data terminal (e.g., a personal computer), a wireless data terminal (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and a hybrid data/voice terminal (e.g., a cordless handset). (See paragraph [0023], lines 4-7.) Nowhere does *Rogalski* disclose providing subscriber-specific information to voice and data services, however. *Rogalski* merely discloses sharing access to a PSTN among multiple terminals.

Combining *Jones* with *Rogalski* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Jones* and *Rogalski* at least do not disclose “wherein the wired data network is

operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services,” as recited by amended Claim 14. Accordingly, independent Claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 14.

Dependent Claims 15-21 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 14, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 15-21.

#### IV. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rogalski* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,224 (“*Jonsson*”). Dependent Claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it includes, due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 1, “wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services.” Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 9, line 19-28.

In contrast, and as stated above, *Rogalski* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from amended Claim 1. For example, *Rogalski* merely discloses that a voice data gateway (VDG) is connected to both a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and a broadband network. (See paragraph [0023], lines 2-4.) *Rogalski*’s VDG is also connected to a wired data terminal (e.g., a personal computer), a wireless data terminal (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and a hybrid data/voice terminal (e.g., a cordless handset). (See paragraph [0023], lines 4-7.)

Nowhere does *Rogalski* disclose providing subscriber-specific information to voice and data services, however. *Rogalski* merely discloses sharing access to a PSTN among multiple terminals.

Furthermore, *Jonsson* does not overcome *Rogalski*'s deficiencies. For example, *Jonsson* merely discloses a multinetwork terminal that includes a handportable multinetwork telephone. (See col. 5, lines 60-62.) The multinetwork telephone provides communication in both a mobile telephony network and in a fixed network having cordless access points. (See col. 5, lines 62-64.) However, *Jonsson*, like *Rogalski*, does not disclose a first wired data network operative to provide subscriber information. Rather, *Jonsson* merely discloses a multinetwork telephone.

Combining *Rogalski* with *Jonsson* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Rogalski* and *Jonsson* at least do not disclose "wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services," as included in dependent Claim 2. Accordingly, dependent Claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claim 2.

#### V. Rejection of Claims 4-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rogalski* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,726 ("*Baek*"). Dependent Claims 4-6 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, "wherein the wired data network

is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services.” Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 9, line 19-28.

In contrast, and as stated above, *Rogalski* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from amended Claim 1. For example, *Rogalski* merely discloses that a voice data gateway (VDG) is connected to both a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and a broadband network. (See paragraph [0023], lines 2-4.) *Rogalski*’s VDG is also connected to a wired data terminal (e.g., a personal computer), a wireless data terminal (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and a hybrid data/voice terminal (e.g., a cordless handset). (See paragraph [0023], lines 4-7.) Nowhere does *Rogalski* disclose providing subscriber-specific information to voice and data services, however. *Rogalski* merely discloses sharing access to a PSTN among multiple terminals.

Furthermore, *Baek* does not overcome *Rogalski*’s deficiencies. For example, *Baek* merely discloses that a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) receives and transmits voice data through a modem that is connected to a Public Switched Data Network (PSDN). (See col. 2, lines 6-8.) *Baek*’s PSDN is connected to a central and local control unit and through PSDN dedicated lines. (See col. 2, lines 8-10.) In *Baek*, the central and local control units are also connected to the PSTN via PSTN trunk lines. (See col. 2, lines 11-13.) The PSTN in *Baek* is further connect to general telephones through PSTN general lines and to public base stations through PSTN dedicated lines. (See col. 2, lines 14-17.) *Baek* is silent regarding any PSDN portions operative to provide subscriber information. Consequently, *Baek*, like *Rogalski* cannot disclose a first wired data network portion operative to provide subscriber information.

Combining *Rogalski* with *Baek* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Rogalski* and *Baek* at least do not disclose “wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services,” as included in dependent Claims 4-6. Accordingly, dependent Claims 4-6 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 4-6.

VI. Rejection of Claims 10-13 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10-13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rogalski* in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0039242 (“*Moore*”). Dependent Claims 10-13 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, “wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services.” Dependent Claim 22 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it includes a similar recitation due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 14.

In contrast, and as stated above, *Rogalski* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from amended Claim 1. For example, *Rogalski* merely discloses that a voice data gateway (VDG) is connected to both a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and a broadband network. (See paragraph [0023], lines 2-4.) *Rogalski*’s VDG is also connected to a wired data terminal (e.g., a personal computer), a wireless data terminal (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and a hybrid data/voice terminal (e.g., a cordless handset). (See paragraph [0023], lines 4-7.)



Furthermore, additional terminals in *Rogalski* can be configured to communicate with the VDG. (See paragraph [0023], lines 7-9.) *Rogalski* fails to disclose the VDG in communication with at least one wired data network portion. Consequently, *Rogalski* cannot disclose a first wired data network portion operative to provide subscriber information.

Furthermore, *Moore* does not overcome *Rogalski*'s deficiencies. For example, *Moore* merely discloses that a local network may comprise a wireless local network. (See paragraph [0030], lines 1-2.) In an alternate embodiment, *Moore*'s local network may comprise a wired network. (See paragraph [0030], lines 2-4.) In *Moore*, a handset is determined to be within local network range when the handset is either physically connected to the wired local network or within a predetermined distant from a wireless network. (See paragraph [0030], lines 4-8.) However, *Moore*, like *Rogalski* does not disclose a first wired data network operative to provide subscriber information.

Combining *Rogalski* with *Moore* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Rogalski* and *Moore* at least do not disclose "wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to the voice and data services," as included in dependent Claims 10-13. Dependent Claim 22 includes a similar recitation due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 14. Accordingly, dependent Claims 10-13 and 22 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 10-13 and 22.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: July 24, 2008

By: /D. Kent Stier/  
D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sm

